

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-20 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12, 17 and 20 are independent.

Claims 1, 8, 17 and 20 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Amendment reduces the issues on appeal by placing the claims in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that Applicant is responding to new grounds of rejection set forth in the Final Office Action.

Drawings

Applicant has not received a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review PTO-948 indicating whether or not the formal drawings have been approved by the Draftsperson. Since no objection has been received, Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1, 8, 12, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language is not clearly understood. Particularly, the Examiner has stated that the difference between "a device" as recited in line 5 (of claim 1) and "a device driving circuit" is not clear.

In order to overcome the rejection of claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1 to correct each deficiency specifically pointed out by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 has been similarly amended. Claims 12, 17 and 20 do not recite an additional "device" in isolation, and therefore, these claims are clear "as is" and further amendment is not necessary.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,784,039 to Yasui in view of the conventional art, and claims 2-7, 9-10, 13-16 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui and the conventional art in view of Lee. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, the Applicant has made no admission that Fig. 2 of the Applicant's disclosure qualifies as statutory prior art. With regard to Yasui, the Examiner has admitted that Yasui fails to teach a voltage controller, disposed between the power supply and the device driving circuit, for simultaneously receiving the gate high voltage and the gate low voltage. The Examiner relies on the Applicant's conventional art to supply the deficiency of Yasui.

The Applicant's disclosure provides that "when a main power VDD is supplied to the power block 10, the gate low voltage VGL and the gate high voltage VGH are simultaneously output from the power block 10 as shown in

Fig. 2.” It indeed appears that said voltages are output from the power block 10 (see Applicant’s Fig. 1). However, these voltages are not both received by a voltage controller, disposed between the power supply and the device driving circuit. As shown in the Applicant’s Fig. 1, VGL is not supplied to a voltage controller, but rather, VGL is supplied to gate driver 6 (directly) from power block 10. In this instance, simultaneously output does not translate into simultaneously received.

Therefore, neither Yasui, nor the Applicant’s conventional art teaches or suggests the combinations recited in independent claims 1, 8, 12, 17 and 20, including simultaneously receiving the gate high voltage and the gate low voltage. Lee cannot supply the deficiencies of Yasui and the Applicant’s conventional art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these art grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-16 and 18-19, Applicant submits that claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-16 and 18-19 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 17, which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore, claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-16 and 18-19 are allowable based on their dependence from claims 1, 8, 12 and 17. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Percy L. Square, Registration No. 51,084, at (703) 205-8034, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Amendment dated August 20, 2004
Response to Office Action of May 20, 2004

Appln. No. 10/025,477
Art Unit: 2675
Page 15 of 15

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: James T. Eller, Jr. #41,458
James T. Eller, Jr.
Reg. No.: 39,538


JTE:PLS:jls:trb

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
Telephone: (703)205-8000